



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.					
10/658,568	09/09/2003	Zhu Dong	684-011485-US (PAR)	3418					
2512 PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824	7590 05/15/2009		<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">HOANG, HIEU T</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		HOANG, HIEU T		
EXAMINER									
HOANG, HIEU T									
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">2452</td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2452			
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER								
2452									
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">05/15/2009</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	05/15/2009		<table border="1"><tr><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	PAPER
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE								
05/15/2009									
PAPER									

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/658,568

**Applicant(s)**

DONG, ZHU

**Examiner**

HIEU T. HOANG

**Art Unit**

2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the communication filed on 04/13/2009.
2. Claim 19 is new.
3. Claims 1-19 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach recording an event in a calendar application of a mobile device and then retrieving data from the stored event which is transmitted to another receiving device at a predetermined time. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior art clearly teaches recording an event in a calendar application of a mobile device and then retrieving data from the stored event which is transmitted to another receiving device at a predetermined time (Ben-Shachar, col. 6 l. 53-col. 7 l. 3, col. 7 l. 41-46, notifications corresponding to received appointments by a calendar, notifications are to be sent at predetermined time in the future)
6. Applicant argues that the message generator is not a mobile communication device. The examiner disagrees. First, from the teachings of Lewis of a desktop computer, it would have been obvious to use a mobile device such as a laptop instead of an immobile device such as a desktop to provide user mobility. Second, Ben-Shachar teaches a mobile device for managing notification (col. 5 lines 63-67)
7. Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach application call. The examiner disagrees. Frederiksen discloses that an application performs an application call (an

invocation of another application) to an editor application on a mobile device and to a call handling application (fig. 6, [0113], [0120], the Call application uses or performs an application call to an editor application). It would have been obvious to use application call to link automatically related programs and therefore create ease of use for the user (Frederiksen, fig. 7). It is noted that Ben-Shachar also teaches application call (col. 6 l. 62-col. 7 l. 3)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-6, 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner cannot find any support for "generate a message associated with a scheduled event recorded in a calendar application ... and to define at least one recipient of said message from data associated with the scheduled event" in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-4, 6 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar et al. (US 6,208,996, hereafter Ben-Shachar), in view of Lewis et al. (US 6,738,635, hereafter Lewis), in view of Frederiksen (US 2002/0080186) and what was known in the art (Official Notice or ON)

12. For claim 1, Ben-Shachar discloses a system comprising:

- a transmitting mobile communication device connected to a communication network (fig. 1, mobile device 3 in communication with desktop computers 4 and 13, and mobile device 10), and said transmitting mobile communication device comprising an event scheduling element (abstract, col. 6 lines 52-61, a calendar application that allows the user to enter an appointment and an associated user notification)
- a scheduled event recorded in a calendar application of the transmitting mobile communication device (col. 7 l. 40-46, appointments in calendar application), and

at least one predetermined time for transmitting said message to the at least one recipient (col. 7 l. 40-46, time to send notification)

- the event scheduling element being further configured to cause transmission of said message to the at least one recipient at said at least one predetermined time (col. 6 l. 53-col. 7 l. 3, sending notification to a recipient at said at least one predetermined time).

Ben-Shachar does not explicitly disclose a message generator to generate a message associated with a scheduled event, and a timing element configured to record the at least one predetermined time in a timing register.

However, Lewis discloses:

- a message generator to generate a message associated with a scheduled event recorded in a calendar application of a transmitting communication device and at least one predetermined time for transmitting said message to the at least one recipient (col. 7 l. 59-62, events recorded in a calendar application, col. 9 l. 9-17, schedule data alert messages associated with an event can be edited by a user, col. 10 lines 57-63, recipient is identified by a message retrieving entity identifier, col. 10 lines 33-43, fig. 6, any data including the message receiving entity is checked for change, col. 11 l. 8-25, user selectable time for delivery of notification message);
- a timing element configured to record the at least one predetermined time in a timing register (col. 11 l. 8-25, storing the user defined time in memory), the event scheduling element being further configured to cause transmission of said

message to the at least one recipient at said at least one predetermined time  
(col. 8 lines 35-39, send notification at a time in advance of schedule event)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar/Lewis to allow the user to edit or modify alert messages to provide a scheduling program with more usage to the user.

Ben-Shachar/Lewis does not disclose that the event scheduling element configured to perform an application call to the message generator.

However, Frederiksen discloses an application call to a editor application that allows user to enter inputs ([0120], [0113], fig. 7, calendar and editor link, calendar application calls on an editor application to enter inputs)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen to perform application call from the scheduling element to the message generator to allow user to define message content and provide ease of use to the user.

Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen does not explicitly disclose the message generator for defining at least one recipient of said message from data associated with the scheduled event. Although Lewis's system is capable of determining any data field changes in the notification message, the fields including a message recipient ID (col. 10 lines 57-63, recipient is identified by a message retrieving entity identifier, col. 10 lines 33-43, fig. 6, any data including the message receiving entity is checked for change)

Official Notice is taken that it was known in the art at the time of the invention to define or enter or select at least one recipient of a message from data associated with the schedule event.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Frederiksen and what was known to define/select at least one recipient of said message from data associated with the scheduled event and allow the user to further decide which recipients to receive the notification message.

13. For claim 19, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses the message further comprises a first message to attend an event that is sent at a first predetermined time and a notification that is sent at a second predetermined time (Ben-Shachar, col. 6 l. 52-67, event notification message at a second predetermined time and event at a first predetermined time, message to attend a scheduled event was known in the art).

14. For claim 2, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses said message comprises a notification or an alert comprising a text, an audio track, a visual image, or any combination thereof (Lewis, col. 9 lines 15-17, text alert messages, Ben-Shachar, col. 6 lines 52-61, audible or visual indicia for notification).

15. For claim 3, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses said message comprises a short messaging service (SMS), a multimedia messaging service (MMS)



message, or unstructured supplementary service data (USSD) (Lewis, col. 6 lines 5-23, col. 10 lines 63-66, col. 11 lines 48-65, short message service SMS).

16. For claim 4, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses said communication network comprises a wireless telecommunication network, a wireless short range short wave radio network, such as Bluetooth, a computer network, or any combination thereof (Lewis, abstract, wireless schedule notification method, Ben-Shachar, fig. 3, wireless mobile device).

17. For claim 6, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses the event scheduling element comprises a calendar element for scheduling events (Ben-Shachar, col. 6 lines 52-54), the calendar element being configured to connect to said message generator to define an event in the calendar element and to generate an event notification in said message and to define a predetermined time for transmitting said event notification to said recipient (Ben-Shachar, col. 6 lines 54-61, Lewis, col. 11 lines 16-25, notification prior to a scheduled event at a predetermined time).

18. For claims 15, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses the recipient comprises one or more mobile communication devices (Lewis, fig. 2, device 34)

19. For claim 16, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON further discloses the recipient is a receiving mobile communication device (Lewis, fig. 2, device 34).

Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON does not explicitly disclose the recipient requested to participate in the event.

However, Official notice is taken that it is extremely known in the art that a meeting or conference event participant requests to participate in the event.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen and ON to allow recipients to request to participate in the event to further provide access control to the event, for example.

20. For claim 17, Official notice is taken that it is extremely known in the art that a host of an event such as a meeting or conference can send a request to invite a participant to participate in the event, before the event time or a notification of a event time.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen and ON to allow conference host to send requests to invite recipients to join the conference to further provide conference control and access to the conference, for example.

21. For claims 18, further Official notice is taken that it was known in the art that more than one recipient or a plurality of recipients can be defined as recipients of the message.

22. Claims 7-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar, in view of Lewis, what was known in the art, and further in view of Chou et al. (US 5,902,352, hereafter Chou).

23. For claim 7, Ben-Shachar discloses an apparatus comprising:

- a keyboard and display for interfacing with an operator (fig. 3), a storage element storing a message generator application adapted to enable said operator to generate content of a message related to one scheduled event in a calendar application of the apparatus (col. 6 lines 52-61, PIM application at user device allow user to generate an appointment and an associated notification, col. 7 l. 40-46, calendar with appointments), configured to perform an application call to a transmission application adapted to process and pass the message to at least one recipient (col. 6 line 62-col. 7 line 3, calling application to present notification to a user) and a processor for processing data and executing said applications stored in said storage element (fig. 4, processor)

Ben-Shachar does not explicitly disclose a timing application configured to record a predetermined time in a timing register, the message generator application for causing transmission of said message to occur according to the predetermined transmission time.

However, Lewis discloses a timing application configured to record a predetermined time in a timing register (col. 11 lines 8-25, storing the user defined time in memory), the message generator application for causing transmission of said message to occur

according to the predetermined transmission time (abstract, col. 8 lines 35-39, col. 11 lines 8-24, transfer a message to a device according to a predetermined time).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar/Lewis to allow the user to edit or modify alert messages to provide a scheduling program with more usage to the user.

Ben-Shachar/Lewis does not explicitly disclose the timing application being adapted to notify the message generator application;

However, Chou discloses a timer used to notify that a scheduled event (such as sending a message) is to occur (abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar, Lewis, and Chou to implement a notification method that allows the user to edit or modify alert message to provide more functionality and user friendliness to the user and also provide automatic function call between functions such as timing and message transmission.

24. For claim 8, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Chou further discloses said message generator application is adapted to call said transmission application for preparing transmission through said message handling element, which during the process is adapted to call the timing application starting a timing function determining the transmission time of said message (Lewis, col. 11, lines 8-24, transmission of a notification message is scheduled by placing a period of time prior to the scheduled event, or calling a timing function to

time for a transmission of the notification message, a message handling element is just a program code that enters the time from the user's input to the timing function).

25. For claim 9, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Chou further discloses comprising the calendar application is configured to enable the operator to perform calendar operations (Ben-Shachar, col. 6 line 52, Lewis, col. 10 lines 5-7) and wherein said calendar application is adapted to call said message generator application for generating a notification to be transmitted in said message at the predetermined time (Lewis, col. 9 lines 15-17, editing an alert message or a notification, col. 11, lines 8-24, transmission of a notification message is scheduled by placing a period of time prior to the scheduled event, or calling a timing function to time for a transmission of the notification message).

26. For claim 14, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Chou further discloses the apparatus comprises a mobile communication device for connecting to a communication network (Lewis, fig. 2, cell phone, Ben-Shachar, fig. 1, mobile devices).

27. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, in view of what was known in the art, and Ben-Shachar and Chou.

28. For claim 10, Lewis discloses a method comprising:

(a) storing in a storage element a message generator application (col. 9 lines 14-18, user can edit the alert message by, e.g., using a known text editor, see Frederiksen, [0120]), a transmission application (col. 11 lines 16-24, delivering or transferring

notifications to a remote user's device), and a timing application (col. 9 line 57-col. 10 line 2),

(b) processing data and executing said applications stored in said storage element by means of a processor (col. 7 lines 56-58),

(c) enabling said operator to generate content of a message related to a scheduled event by means of said message generator application interfacing with said operator through a display and keyboard (col. 9 lines 9-17, schedule data alert messages associated with an event can be edited by a user (first message), col. 10 lines 57-63, recipient is identified by a message retrieving entity identifier, col. 7 lines 58-62, user enters or schedules an event (second message))

(d) enabling said operator to define a predetermined time for transmitting said message to at least one recipient, the timing application for recording the predetermined time in a timing register (col. 10 lines 55-64, define recipient, time to be delivered, col. 11 lines 8-25, storing the user defined time in memory),

(e) forwarding the message from the message generator application to the transmission application for processing and passing said message by means of said transmission application (col. 11 lines 16-24, transferring notifications to a remote user's device),

(f) timing transmission of said message according to said predetermined transmission time by means of said timing application (col. 11 lines 16-24, timing the scheduled event);

(g) transmitting said message from a device through a communication network at said predetermined time by means of a message handling element operable by said

transmission application (col. 8 lines 35-39, send notification in advance of schedule event)

Lewis does not explicitly disclose said operator to define at least one recipient of said message.

However, Official Notice is taken that it was known in the art at the time of the invention to define or enter at least one recipient of a message.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lewis and what was known to allow the user to further decide which recipients to receive the notification message.

Lewis/ON does not explicitly disclose communication between the message generator application and the timing application is by application call, and the transmitting device is a mobile communication device; a scheduled event stored in a calendar application in the storage element.

However, Ben-Shachar discloses application calls (col. 6 line 62-col. 7 line 4, col. 8 lines 38-42, API calls) and a mobile communication device for scheduling (fig. 1, mobile device 3 in communication with desktop computers 4 and 13, and mobile device 10); and a scheduled event stored in a calendar application in the storage element (col. 76 l. 40-45, scheduled calendar events in calendar application)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lewis/ON and Ben-Shachar to perform application call from the scheduling element to the message generator to provide ease of use to the user.

Lewis/ON/Ben-Shachar does not disclose where the timing application continuously checks the predetermined time against an internal clock and generates a notification to the message generator application for initiating the transmission of the message.

However, Chou discloses setting a timer which indicates the time which should elapse until a scheduled event (such as sending a message) is to be activated (abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lewis, ON, Ben-Shachar and Chou to implement a notification method on a mobile device that allows the user to edit or modify alert message and to implement the use of a timer to activate an event as disclosed by Chou.

29. Claim 11 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 10.

30. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON, as applied to claim 1, further in view of Chou.

31. For claim 12, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON does not disclose the message generator is configured to send a counting start request to the timing element wherein the predetermined time is registered in the timing register in response to the counting start request.



However, Chou discloses setting a timer (fig. 8 step 810 and 815) which indicates the time which should elapse until a scheduled event (such as sending a message) is to be activated (abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar, Lewis, Frederiksen, what was known and Chou to implement a notification method on a mobile device that allows the user to edit or modify alert message to provide more functionality and user friendliness to the user.

32. For claim 13, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON/Chou further discloses the timing element is configured to continually check the predetermined time with an internal clock function and send a counting done signal to the message generator when the predetermined time is reached to initiate the sending of the message (Chou, abstract, when timer expires, task is activated, fig. 8 step 835).

33. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON, as applied to claim 4, further in view of Kawamoto et al. (US 7,194,558, hereafter Kawamoto)

34. For claim 5, Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON does not disclose said communication network further comprises a television network connecting to a gateway connected to said telecommunication network, said computer network, or said Bluetooth network.

However, Kawamoto discloses said communication network further comprises a television network connecting to a gateway connected to said telecommunication network, said computer network, or said Bluetooth network (fig. 1, col. 6 lines 1-8, a home gateway is connected between a public communication network including a telephone line, a cable television, and ISDN, the mobile device can be connected to a telephone line using a wireless phone, or a PDA wirelessly connected through the Internet using a Bluetooth connection, which is well known in the art).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ben-Shachar/Lewis/Frederiksen/ON and Kawamoto to implement a gateway having advanced functionality by adding functions of routing information providing processing to a gateway in a network configuration, such as an Ethernet, including a TV, phones, and PCs to reduce the cost of building separate transmission lines (Kawamoto, col. 1 line 64-col. 2 line 5).

### ***Conclusion***

35. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/658,568

Page 19

Art Unit: 2452

HH

/Kenny S Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452